

The Sun.

MONDAY, AUGUST 10, 1908.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month.....\$0 50
 DAILY, Per Year.....6 00
 SUNDAY, Per Year.....2 00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year.....8 00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month.....70

Postage to foreign countries added.
 All checks, money orders, &c., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 10 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer of the Association, William M. Laffan, 170 Nassau street, Secretary of the Association, Franklin Bartlett, 57 Nassau street.

London office, 21 Abchurch Lane, 1 Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4. The daily and Sunday Sun is on sale in London at Murray's Exchange, Trafalgar Buildings, Northumberland Avenue; Pall Mall American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street, Piccadilly; and Dawson's Steamship Agency, 17 Green street, Leicester Square.

Paris office, 32 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosque 17, Boulevard des Capucines; corner Place de l'Opera; and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Italiens, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

The Lambeth Conference.

An encyclical issued on August 7 from Lambeth Palace sets forth the results of the deliberations of the 243 Bishops who took part in the Lambeth Conference which has just come to an end. Although the decisions of this conference are not binding on the American Protestant Episcopal Church many of them cannot fail to exert much influence upon it, and consequently they deserve careful attention.

We can point to but one of the eighty-six resolutions adopted by the conference which seems to have no chance of acceptance on this side of the Atlantic, if indeed it has any in British India, in the Australian Commonwealth or in British North America. We refer to the avowal that "all races of people, whatever their language and conditions, must be welded into one body, and the organization of different races living side by side into separate or independent churches on the basis of race or color is inconsistent with the vital and essential principle of the unity of Christ's Church." It is well known that in our Southern States the white and the colored members of the Episcopal Church will not worship together and the same thing may be said of almost every other Protestant sect in the country south of the Potomac and Ohio. In many a Northern city also the whites and the negroes form separate congregations though they may belong to the same religious denomination.

There is no likelihood that this custom will be modified by the exhortation of the Lambeth Conference. It is well known also that in British India, although a good many native converts to Christianity have been made, their places of worship are not frequented as a rule by white people. In the Australian colonies and in British Columbia Christian missionaries have organized not a few Chinese and Japanese into religious societies, but public opinion constrains them to worship apart from the dominant white element of the community. So far, then, as Greater Britain and the United States are concerned this particular resolution of the Lambeth Conference must be regarded as merely a pious wish or counsel of perfection. This seems to be recognized by the Archbishop of Canterbury himself, who in the encyclical admits that the solution of racial problems is the despair of statesmen, while at the same time he deems it the duty of the Church to face the perplexities which daunt civil rulers.

Another decision which the Lambeth Conference can hardly hope will be respected in the Australian Commonwealth—much less in the United States—is that which by the very close vote of 87 to 84 pronounces it undesirable that the innocent party to a divorce for adultery receive the blessing of the Church upon remarriage. We are not surprised that nearly half of the members of the conference who voted hesitated to set themselves above the civil laws of their respective countries in this particular. We add that one should avoid misconstruing the sympathy expressed by the Lambeth Conference with the socialistic movement in so far as that movement aims to procure for all persons fair treatment and a real opportunity to live true human lives. It is undoubtedly the teaching of every Protestant sect as well as of the Catholic Church that individual property is a trust held for the benefit of the community and that the moral responsibility of the individual owner embraces the character and general social effect of any business in which his money is invested, the treatment of employees therein and the payment of just wages. That is to say, what is inculcated in this resolution of the Lambeth Conference is the observance of justice, equity and philanthropy, and not socialism in a correct sense of the word.

The Liquor Question in New Jersey.

The Hon. JOHN FRANKLIN FORT was elected Governor of New Jersey last November because he pledged himself to enforce the Bishops' law, sometimes called the Sunday closing act. "The bill was passed," as he said in a speech opening the campaign in Newark, "in response to the moral and religious demands of the State." The moral and religious people of New Jersey rallied to the polls and elected Judge FORT after he had declared in a speech at Princeton, a moral and religious centre: "The Bishops' law will not be repealed unless it is over my veto."

The emergency has arisen; Governor FORT is face to face with his responsibility, but he is helpless to enforce the law which he helped to enact in good faith. In the cities of New Jersey the Sunday closing act is a dead letter, except in Newark, where, to quote the Sun-

day Call, there is "a good enforcement" of the law, owing "to the vigilance of a Sheriff with a reverence for law and to Grand Jurors composed of men who respect their oaths." This vigilant Sheriff is FRANK SOMMER, the New Jersey lieutenant of Senator COLBY. In Jersey City, Atlantic City and Elizabeth the law has been contemptuously violated and conditions exist that are a public scandal. On a recent Sunday the clergymen of all denominations in Elizabeth thundered from their pulpits. "The situation in Atlantic City," declares Governor FORT, fresh from a perusal of the State Excise Commission's report, "is one that must shock all lovers of the law."

The police in cities other than Newark have failed to see what was passing under their eyes. Grand Jurors have not found enough evidence to justify indictments, and Prosecutors and Judges, according to Governor FORT, "openly state that they cannot enforce the law." They explain that public sentiment is so hostile to the Bishops' law that it is useless to impel Grand Jurors to find indictments. "Remove Judges, Prosecutors and Sheriffs," is the cry raised by the good people who elected Governor FORT. This he cannot do, for the derelicts are constitutional officers and removable only upon impeachment by the Legislature.

Therefore the Governor cannot enforce the law. He can but reflect the moral sentiment of the State and make recommendations to the Legislature for the better enforcement of the law. The country is for it, the cities against it—even Newark, as the overwhelming election of Mayor HAUSCHILD proved. So that the liquor question is very much in politics in New Jersey, and no man can tell what the complexion of the next Legislature will be and what it will do.

The Addyston Pipe Case.

One of the principal addresses delivered before the Virginia Bar Association at its recent meeting at Hot Springs was a paper read by the Hon. WILLIAM LINDSAY, formerly Senator from Kentucky, on the subject of "Corporation Control." It possesses peculiar interest just at this time by reason of the fact that Mr. WILLIAM H. TAFT was in the audience and afterward made some comments upon the views of the speaker which are quite clearly expressive of the opinions that he himself now entertains in regard to the scope of Federal legislation over corporations engaged in interstate commerce.

Senator LINDSAY declared that great corporations, with the combinations of capital which they control, were proving to be the greatest instruments for evil that man had ever devised. In order to restrain their power to increase material prosperity at the expense of the freedom of our institutions he contended that it was not enough to appeal to the authorities at Washington. Corporations being created by the States under whose laws they were called into existence, resort should be had to the States to reduce their privileges and limit the immunities which they enjoy at the expense of the public welfare. In short, the position of the speaker was that the remedy for the injury which the country is suffering from corporate greed must be sought from the Governments of the respective States rather than from the national Government. He concluded his address by this quotation from a speech by Judge TAFT: "It is settled, and rightfully settled, that the national Government can do nothing in this direction except where such trusts are for the purpose of interstate commerce."

In commenting upon this portion of Senator LINDSAY's address Mr. TAFT said: "My position is that there is no objection to State control within the States, but unless a corporation sells its product in other States than that in which it is created it will do little business. Selling in other States constitutes interstate commerce, and of that there should be and can be Federal supervision. That was settled in the Addyston pipe case."

This reference to the Addyston pipe case makes it worth while to inquire just what questions arose and precisely what was decided in that famous litigation.

A suit was instituted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio in behalf of the United States against the Addyston Pipe and Steel Company of Cincinnati and five other corporations to obtain an injunction under the Sherman anti-trust act to restrain the defendants, who were engaged in the manufacture, sale and transportation of iron pipe, from continuing to act under or carry on a combination into which they were alleged to have entered and which was charged to be illegal and unlawful under the statute because it was in restraint of trade and commerce among the several States of the Union.

The District Court decided in favor of the defendants and dismissed the petition. The Government appealed to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, of which WILLIAM H. TAFT was then a member, and that tribunal reversed the decision of the District Court and directed a decree to be entered which should perpetually enjoin the defendants from maintaining the combination in the manufacture, sale and transportation of cast iron pipe as described in the petition and from doing any business as such combination. Thereupon the defendants appealed to the Supreme Court at Washington, where the case was argued in April and decided in December, 1899. The opinion of the court was written by Mr. Justice PECKHAM, with whom all his associates concurred, and it was in favor of the Government upon every question involved in the litigation, except that the form of the injunction granted by the Circuit Court was slightly modified because a little too broad in its terms. This slight error was characterized by Judge PECKHAM as probably due merely to inadvertence.

The proof showed that in 1894 the six corporations that were made defendants had entered into an agreement in regard to the manufacture and sale of cast iron pipe which substantially provided that there should be no competition between them in any of the thirty-six States and Territories mentioned in the agreement. When first made the contract further provided for a system of bonuses pay-

able to the respective parties for the purpose of restricting competition and maintaining prices. This method proved unsuccessful and in 1895 an alteration was made in the contract and a substituted plan was adopted whereby orders for pipe were to be submitted to competitive bidding for the privilege of manufacturing under each order and the party securing the order "should have the protection of all the other bidders."

It is not necessary to state the details of the arrangement with any further particularity. There was no substantial denial of the combination on the part of the defendants as alleged in the petition, but their contention was that their association was entered into for the purpose of avoiding the losses which they would otherwise sustain in consequence of the ruinous competition between manufacturers of cast iron pipe. Being formed for this purpose, they contended that the combination could not properly be deemed and should not be deemed to be a violation of the Sherman act.

The first proposition upon which the defendants based their appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States was that the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution applies only to the protection of interstate commerce from interference by State legislation or through the agency of regulations made under the authority of a State, and that it does not carry with it the general power on the part of Congress to prohibit private contracts between individuals or corporations, even though it may happen that such private contracts relate to interstate commerce, and in fact result in the obstruction of such commerce. It was contended that the Constitution guarantees liberty of private contract to the citizen upon commercial subjects as well as upon others, and that it was not the purpose of the framers of that instrument to do anything more by the enactment of the interstate commerce clause than to insure uniformity of regulation against unfavorable and discriminating action upon the part of the State Legislatures. The Supreme Court, however, expressly declined to adopt this view, declaring that the Constitution does not exclude Congress from legislating in reference to private contracts in the exercise of its power to regulate commerce between States. "On the contrary," said Justice PECKHAM, "we think the provision regarding the liberty of the citizen is to some extent limited by the commerce clause of the Constitution and that the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce comprises the right to enact a law prohibiting the citizen from entering into those contracts which directly and substantially and not merely indirectly, remotely, incidentally and collaterally regulate to a greater or less degree commerce among the States."

He pointed out as indicative of the prevailing view in the legal profession on the subject that no State Legislature had attempted to authorize contracts which would necessarily involve a regulation of interstate commerce. In the second place the appellants endeavored to justify the combination on the ground that even admitting that it affected interstate commerce the contract was merely a reasonable restraint upon ruinous competition among themselves, and being formed to prevent such competition and thereby secure prices for pipe which were fair and reasonable to the public as well as to themselves, it must be deemed unobjectionable in law. The Supreme Court did not pass upon the question whether these facts, assuming them to be true, would constitute a valid defense, but expressed its agreement with the view taken by Circuit Judge TAFT in the Circuit Court of Appeals to the effect that the combination was in fact designed to enhance prices beyond a sum which was fair and reasonable.

In the case of the United States against the C. C. Knight company, decided some years previously, the Supreme Court had held that the American Sugar Refining Company, although it had entered into a combination whereby it obtained a practical monopoly of the manufacture of sugar, was nevertheless not liable to prosecution under the Sherman act because the combination related only to manufacture and not to commerce between the States or with foreign countries. The Addyston Pipe Company and its associates invoked the doctrine of this decision in their behalf. Mr. Justice PECKHAM, however, distinguished the cases upon the facts. In the Knight case, he said, there was no agreement in regard to the future disposition of the manufactured article, whereas in the Addyston pipe case it was clearly the purpose of the combination directly to impose a restraint upon interstate commerce in regard to the pipe which should be manufactured by any of the parties to the contract to be transported beyond the State in which it was made. Each corporation was bound not to send any of its goods out of the State in which they were manufactured to be sold in any other State unless it did so in accordance with the terms of the agreement.

The significance of Judge TAFT's reference to this decision in the Addyston pipe case is this: It is a declaration of his opinion that only Congress possesses adequate power to restrain and prevent such a combination between corporations as was there under consideration—that is to say, a combination intended to enhance the price of a manufactured article upon its transportation to a locality other than the State in which it is made. The decision of the Supreme Court establishes the power of Congress to deal with such combinations and by implication negatives that of the Legislatures of the several States to do so.

Beveridge's Law or Something Just as Good.
 Senator BEVERIDGE, wherever he may be at present, is in a position to point with pride at the operation of the child labor law in Washington. That is where he altitudinized and gesticulated and released the floodgates of his vociferation and generally made himself preposterous and irritating for so long. That is where he can now contemplate the first fruits of the statute for which he labored so pesterously.

According to a Washington paper, one of the boys who had all the radicalism we can chew for a little while. It's a case of obow or choke with us," said one of Mayor Tom's disciples. "Chew or choke," this is the Johns dilemma at the moment, with the odds in favor of the choking.

Mr. Bryan and his friends humbled Mayor Tom at Denver. Three Cent Tom openly attacked Judson Harmon in speech and in letter, and the Democrats of Ohio nominated him for Governor. Hence it is fairly obvious that the Johnson following is of the reservation—or it would be if it could forget the three cent problem.

"Run may make Tom regular." This is the single consolation for the Democrat who desires to see the ticket elected. The significance of this comment is that the liquor dealers of Cleveland are strongly opposed to the ticket of Bryan and Johnson, and the Johnson machine must be practical.

"Call mine a machine and the other fellow's the organization," is the way Mayor Tom sums it up with genial frankness. The Johnson followers may support the State ticket of necessity, but there will be very few costs taken off. Worst of all, the Johnson machine will not even concede that a national campaign is afoot. They are as radical as Iowa, these Cuyahoga county Democrats, but as provincial as Manhattan. So at last, on the very threshold of the reactionary East, Mr. Bryan is denounced as a "mere office seeking reactionary." He may be radical enough to vote for Kansas, but he is far too reactionary for the "Three Cent Ticket," which is nervously fingering the other two pennies.

Persons in that line of business in these parts will save their bacon by looking out for the engine when the bell rings. There are times in the course of political events when the people have to have their own way.

Many letters from writers in various parts of the country who say they are Republicans but intend to vote for Mr. Bryan this year have reached the editorial office.—Des Moines Register.

But there's a suspicious paucity of names of Republicans who intend to vote for Mr. Bryan. Meanwhile Judge TAFT's press bureau produces a daily list of Democrats, bona fide, conspicuous and unabashed, who vow that they will cast their ballots for him in the coming election. The official photographer is incessant. On Saturday the candidate was taken in the midst of a group of "twenty-five prominent Democrats" (names supplied) at White Sulphur Springs. The landslide for Mr. BRYAN is very slow in getting under way.

Mr. BRYAN will see a confirmation of his worst fears in the blowing overboard at the Fingy Conners picnic of a Bryan and Kern subscription paper.

A pamphlet has been published in Berlin by Herr von NOTTOWE of the Berliner Lokalanzeiger "to show the real as against the legendary Roosevelt." Vain effort when one considers what the legendary ROOSEVELT will become.

Wants to Be "Shown."
 To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: In this morning's SUN I find under the caption "Roosevelt Hears of Hughes" an account of what a Great Personage apparently deems best for the political welfare of this State at present. Now, I am not from Missouri, but I hope the people of New York will "show me" why this has to be.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 8.

Government Guarantee of Business.
 To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Why not have a national guarantee of all small businesses? I put my money into a meat market and got cleaned out. Have no bank deposit to guarantee, but would like to have my meat business guaranteed when I get on my feet again.

BUTCHER.
 CHICAGO, AUGUST 7.

"At Last a Truthful Man!"
 To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: How refreshing that General Corbin was! But, then, one must give due consideration to the fact that his version of the Brownsville affair fits in just at this time admirably with the exigencies of the political situation.

LEONARD CULVER.
 MONTGOMERY, Ala., AUGUST 7.

Mate in the Flat and in the Beer Garden.
 To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Has a saloon keeper who runs a summer garden restaurant any right to keep a whole neighborhood of respectable and peace loving citizens awake until midnight every night in the week? Surely, no! With a noisy band playing a repertoire of the "Merry Widow" and ragtime orchestra (or have the long suffering neighbors the right to demand a clause in their leases constraining them to cease musical noise at 10:30 P. M. Good! but why should not the beer-keepers also abide the same rule, thereby allowing their brains and overworked eyes nerves a chance to get a little restful sleep before the midnight hour?

NEW YORK, AUGUST 7.

Sartorial.
 Now Bryan starts in begging: We wonder not thereat: He has been twice stolen: He has to pass the hat.

The Acceptance.
 From the Cleveland Plain Dealer.
 Oh, men must sell and men must not a hat! And life is what they make it: But when all is said and done, That William J. will take it!

THE SUN AND REGULARITY IN THE THREE CENT CITY.
 CLEVELAND, AUG. 7.—The game of politics in the home of the Three Cent One is sui generis, not to be duplicated from Maine to California. Here is the radicalism, "intelligent radicalism," beside which the progressive propaganda of the Roosevelt West is as conservative as ginger pop. The following is a typical introduction to the Cleveland brand as supplied by a prominent disciple and officeholder of Three Cent Tom:

"No, of course I am not going to vote for Bryan or Harmon, but I don't care to make a public statement, because I am anxious to get the Bryan men to cut Harmon and the Harmon men to cut Bryan."

The trouble with Mr. Bryan, the really fatal difficulty in Cleveland, lies in the fact that he is a conservative, a reactionary.

Just for a handful of votes he left us. I say the followers of Mayor Tom.

"Once he was a prophet, now he is only a grandfather looking for a job." This is another illuminating comment.

"If we were intellectually on the level with ourselves we should vote for Debe," is a statement frequently heard here.

It is evident that the Three Cent dispensation is troubled, yet its political troubles, State and national, are as nothing; the real trouble is at home. It is not Bryan, it is not physical valuation, it is not the Oklahoma bank law that is agitating the Johnson soul. Not in the least. It is the grim, horrid, omnipresent spectre of the five cent fare.

For the Three Cent variety has almost failed. And for Mayor Tom down to his last political follower there is nothing but the three cent problem.

Our city had all the radicalism we can chew for a little while. It's a case of obow or choke with us," said one of Mayor Tom's disciples. "Chew or choke," this is the Johns dilemma at the moment, with the odds in favor of the choking.

Mr. Bryan and his friends humbled Mayor Tom at Denver. Three Cent Tom openly attacked Judson Harmon in speech and in letter, and the Democrats of Ohio nominated him for Governor. Hence it is fairly obvious that the Johnson following is of the reservation—or it would be if it could forget the three cent problem.

"Run may make Tom regular." This is the single consolation for the Democrat who desires to see the ticket elected. The significance of this comment is that the liquor dealers of Cleveland are strongly opposed to the ticket of Bryan and Johnson, and the Johnson machine must be practical.

"Call mine a machine and the other fellow's the organization," is the way Mayor Tom sums it up with genial frankness. The Johnson followers may support the State ticket of necessity, but there will be very few costs taken off. Worst of all, the Johnson machine will not even concede that a national campaign is afoot. They are as radical as Iowa, these Cuyahoga county Democrats, but as provincial as Manhattan. So at last, on the very threshold of the reactionary East, Mr. Bryan is denounced as a "mere office seeking reactionary." He may be radical enough to vote for Kansas, but he is far too reactionary for the "Three Cent Ticket," which is nervously fingering the other two pennies.

RUM AND REGULARITY IN THE THREE CENT CITY.

CLEVELAND, AUG. 7.—The game of politics in the home of the Three Cent One is sui generis, not to be duplicated from Maine to California. Here is the radicalism, "intelligent radicalism," beside which the progressive propaganda of the Roosevelt West is as conservative as ginger pop. The following is a typical introduction to the Cleveland brand as supplied by a prominent disciple and officeholder of Three Cent Tom:

"No, of course I am not going to vote for Bryan or Harmon, but I don't care to make a public statement, because I am anxious to get the Bryan men to cut Harmon and the Harmon men to cut Bryan."

The trouble with Mr. Bryan, the really fatal difficulty in Cleveland, lies in the fact that he is a conservative, a reactionary.

Just for a handful of votes he left us. I say the followers of Mayor Tom.

"Once he was a prophet, now he is only a grandfather looking for a job." This is another illuminating comment.

"If we were intellectually on the level with ourselves we should vote for Debe," is a statement frequently heard here.

It is evident that the Three Cent dispensation is troubled, yet its political troubles, State and national, are as nothing; the real trouble is at home. It is not Bryan, it is not physical valuation, it is not the Oklahoma bank law that is agitating the Johnson soul. Not in the least. It is the grim, horrid, omnipresent spectre of the five cent fare.

For the Three Cent variety has almost failed. And for Mayor Tom down to his last political follower there is nothing but the three cent problem.

Our city had all the radicalism we can chew for a little while. It's a case of obow or choke with us," said one of Mayor Tom's disciples. "Chew or choke," this is the Johns dilemma at the moment, with the odds in favor of the choking.

Mr. Bryan and his friends humbled Mayor Tom at Denver. Three Cent Tom openly attacked Judson Harmon in speech and in letter, and the Democrats of Ohio nominated him for Governor. Hence it is fairly obvious that the Johnson following is of the reservation—or it would be if it could forget the three cent problem.

"Run may make Tom regular." This is the single consolation for the Democrat who desires to see the ticket elected. The significance of this comment is that the liquor dealers of Cleveland are strongly opposed to the ticket of Bryan and Johnson, and the Johnson machine must be practical.

"Call mine a machine and the other fellow's the organization," is the way Mayor Tom sums it up with genial frankness. The Johnson followers may support the State ticket of necessity, but there will be very few costs taken off. Worst of all, the Johnson machine will not even concede that a national campaign is afoot. They are as radical as Iowa, these Cuyahoga county Democrats, but as provincial as Manhattan. So at last, on the very threshold of the reactionary East, Mr. Bryan is denounced as a "mere office seeking reactionary." He may be radical enough to vote for Kansas, but he is far too reactionary for the "Three Cent Ticket," which is nervously fingering the other two pennies.

Persons in that line of business in these parts will save their bacon by looking out for the engine when the bell rings. There are times in the course of political events when the people have to have their own way.

Many letters from writers in various parts of the country who say they are Republicans but intend to vote for Mr. Bryan this year have reached the editorial office.—Des Moines Register.

But there's a suspicious paucity of names of Republicans who intend to vote for Mr. Bryan. Meanwhile Judge TAFT's press bureau produces a daily list of Democrats, bona fide, conspicuous and unabashed, who vow that they will cast their ballots for him in the coming election. The official photographer is incessant. On Saturday the candidate was taken in the midst of a group of "twenty-five prominent Democrats" (names supplied) at White Sulphur Springs. The landslide for Mr. BRYAN is very slow in getting under way.

Mr. BRYAN will see a confirmation of his worst fears in the blowing overboard at the Fingy Conners picnic of a Bryan and Kern subscription paper.

A pamphlet has been published in Berlin by Herr von NOTTOWE of the Berliner Lokalanzeiger "to show the real as against the legendary Roosevelt." Vain effort when one considers what the legendary ROOSEVELT will become.

Wants to Be "Shown."
 To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: In this morning's SUN I find under the caption "Roosevelt Hears of Hughes" an account of what a Great Personage apparently deems best for the political welfare of this State at present. Now, I am not from Missouri, but I hope the people of New York will "show me" why this has to be.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 8.

Government Guarantee of Business.
 To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Why not have a national guarantee of all small businesses? I put my money into a meat market and got cleaned out. Have no bank deposit to guarantee, but would like to have my meat business guaranteed when I get on my feet again.

BUTCHER.
 CHICAGO, AUGUST 7.

"At Last a Truthful Man!"
 To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: How refreshing that General Corbin was! But, then, one must give due consideration to the fact that his version of the Brownsville affair fits in just at this time admirably with the exigencies of the political situation.

LEONARD CULVER.
 MONTGOMERY, Ala., AUGUST 7.

Mate in the Flat and in the Beer Garden.
 To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Has a saloon keeper who runs a summer garden restaurant any right to keep a whole neighborhood of respectable and peace loving citizens awake until midnight every night in the week? Surely, no! With a noisy band playing a repertoire of the "Merry Widow" and ragtime orchestra (or have the long suffering neighbors the right to demand a clause in their leases constraining them to cease musical noise at 10:30 P. M. Good! but why should not the beer-keepers also abide the same rule, thereby allowing their brains and overworked eyes nerves a chance to get a little restful sleep before the midnight hour?

NEW YORK, AUGUST 7.

Sartorial.
 Now Bryan starts in begging: We wonder not thereat: He has been twice stolen: He has to pass the hat.

The Acceptance.
 From the Cleveland Plain Dealer.
 Oh, men must sell and men must not a hat! And life is what they make it: But when all is said and done, That William J. will take it!

THE SUN AND REGULARITY IN THE THREE CENT CITY.
 CLEVELAND, AUG. 7.—The game of politics in the home of the Three Cent One is sui generis, not to be duplicated from Maine to California. Here is the radicalism, "intelligent radicalism," beside which the progressive propaganda of the Roosevelt West is as conservative as ginger pop. The following is a typical introduction to the Cleveland brand as supplied by a prominent disciple and officeholder of Three Cent Tom:

"No, of course I am not going to vote for Bryan or Harmon, but I don't care to make a public statement, because I am anxious to get the Bryan men to cut Harmon and the Harmon men to cut Bryan."

The trouble with Mr. Bryan, the really fatal difficulty in Cleveland, lies in the fact that he is a conservative, a reactionary.

Just for a handful of votes he left us. I say the followers of Mayor Tom.

"Once he was a prophet, now he is only a grandfather looking for a job." This is another illuminating comment.

"If we were intellectually on the level with ourselves we should vote for Debe," is a statement frequently heard here.

It is evident that the Three Cent dispensation is troubled, yet its political troubles, State and national, are as nothing; the real trouble is at home. It is not Bryan, it is not physical valuation, it is not the Oklahoma bank law that is agitating the Johnson soul. Not in the least. It is the grim, horrid, omnipresent spectre of the five cent fare.

Hughes imbroglia has greatly stimulated the national Democratic hope of carrying New York. There is no doubt, moreover, despite the brave talk of the Democrats in the middle West, that without New York they have no hope. Thus there is an instant proof of the fact that the Hughes problem has a national phase. Because of the national phase, moreover, the Republicans of the country seem to have made up their minds with great unanimity and no small degree of decision.

When you board a street car in Cleveland you may see three cents and then ask for a transfer. For this transfer you pay another cent. When you surrender it your fourth penny flows flyingly back. Of course you realize that it is yours, was due you from the start, but there is a pleasurable sensation, unusual to a New Yorker, of having actually wrung something from a wicked corporation, of having wrested a rebate from a common carrier. It is all a mere transitory illusion, but it tickles the innate anxiety of the mere proletarian.

Most everyone in Cleveland has heard of this three cent and the forecast of the drawing night of the evil days. Twenty hours out of the twenty-four Mayor Tom sits in his office—the Municipal Traction office—puzzling out a safe return to a five cent fare. Nationally, in the State campaign and locally there is but one issue in Cleveland. For Three Cent Tom is wrestling with the all absorbing dilemma—"a nickel or bust" for the company or "a nickel and bust" for his political organization. Hence the lack of interest in the national campaign in Cuyahoga county.

THE CUP TO CARPENTER.

Approval of the Plan, Provided President Sullivan Proves His Case.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I am pleased to see that the Olympean competitors on August 29, patronized by President Roosevelt and Governor Hughes, Mr. Sullivan's only assertion of fact that I have seen is that Carpenter was "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." The contradictions alluded to are: (1) A competitor who was in a good position to judge, Mr. Sullivan's only assertion of fact that I have seen is that Carpenter was "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (2) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (3) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (4) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (5) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (6) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (7) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (8) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (9) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (10) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (11) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (12) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (13) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (14) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (15) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (16) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (17) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (18) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (19) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (20) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (21) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (22) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (23) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (24) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (25) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (26) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race that he had been "fully three strikes ahead of the alleged foul." (27) Carpenter was reported at the time as saying in a statement just after the race